

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 1, 5, 8, 21, 26, 42-43, and 45-47 have been amended to clarify the stretching of the hydrophilic polymer film. Support for the amendments is found in the original application, in particular on page 4, line 34 (swelling treatment of claim 42).

Also, the specification has been amended to correct an experimental result error in Table 1 (namely, the shrinkage force of the polarizer of Example 5 is 12.3, the same as that of the polarizer of Comparative Example 5). It is submitted that the error and its correction are immediate because the manufacturing method for the polarizer in Example 5 and Comparative Example 5 is identical, and Table 2 confirms that the relevant difference between Example 5 and Comparative Example 5 is the thickness of the protective film.

Claims 1-18, 21-35 and 42-47 are pending in the present application. Independent claims 1, 22 and 42 are directed to a polarizer. Independent claim 8 is directed to a polarizing plate. Claims 2-18 and 21 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 1, claims 23-35 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 8, and claims 43-47 are dependent on claim 42.

In addition to the remarks set forth in the Amendment filed on October 10, 2003, Applicants submit the following regarding the Advisory Action dated November 21, 2003.

In the Advisory Action, it is alleged that the film of Kobayashi is used as a polarizer by reference to col. 3, lines 34-40 of Kobayashi. However, this passage of Kobayashi concerns in fact the protective resin film to which Kobayashi is directed overall. In contrast, Kobayashi only mentions a polarizer, without further details, as a background for describing its protective film. Therefore, the passage at col. 3, lines 34-40 is clearly not applicable to the polarizer.

Also, in the Advisory Action, it is alleged that the use of commercial polarizer film in

Miyatake is “not germane to patentability.” However, Applicants’ position is that the combination of references including Miyatake fails to teach or suggest the presently claimed properties because Miyatake relies on the use of prior art commercial polarizer film, and the other references fail to remedy this deficiency of Miyatake. Neither the Advisory Action nor the previous Office Action address this point.

In contrast, Applicants submit that a person of ordinary skill in the art could not arrive at the present invention because that person would use the prior art polarizer used in Miyatake.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial Number: 09/882,671

Group Art Unit: 1774

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No. 020581

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 822-1100

Fax: (202) 822-1111

Customer No.: 38834

NES:rep

Encl.: Request for Continued Examination

Petition for One-Month Extension of Time